UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/892,228	06/25/2001	Jeffrey H. Alger	5486-0169PUS1	3296	
	7590 03/05/200 ART, KOLASCH & B	EXAMINER			
PO Box 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			CHEA, PHILIP J		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2453			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/05/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/892,228	ALGER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
PHILIP J. CHEA	2453	

	PHILIP J. CHEA	2453					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>20 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS .	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.					
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; o	hich places the (3) a Request				
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> </ul>	of the final rejection						
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> </ul>							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
	liamas with 27 OFD 44 27 mount has						
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the company of the property of the company of the comp</li></ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause				
(c) They have not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	• •	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
<u> </u>	21 San attached Nation of Nan Co.	mpliant Amandment (	DTOL 224)				
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ul>		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).				
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Claim(s) rejected: <u>6-8,10-14 and 25-45</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:							
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/ARIO ETIENNE/	Philip I Chas						
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457	Philip J Chea Examiner Art Unit: 2453						

Continuation of 13. Other: Chang discloses a depth parameter that will limit the depth of user clicks within a web page. Although, the depth may take away the inherent sufring capabilities, the Examiner believes that one of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to set the depth to zero if the goal was to limit the pages to only that supplied by the educational authority. The funcionality of Chang would allow an authorized user to set this depth parameter. A depth of zero would not destroy the functional capabilities disclosed by Chang since the depth parameter can be modified. Bernstein provides an interface that limits the interface of the browser to hide the address bar to prevent tampering with the browser software. Given that Chang discloses an educational purpose browser, it would be obvious to prevent students from tampering with the browser software. The browser disclosed by Bernstein would still allow the user to peruse the current web page and read its contents, but would prevent the user from performing certain actions that are prohibited by the teacher for example.